DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 037 711 AL 002 336

AUTHOR	Stevens, Alan M.
TITLE	Case Grammar in Philippine Languages. Preliminary Draft.
PUB DATE	Dec 69
NOTE	16p.; Paper presented at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Francisco, December 1969
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.90
DESCRIPTORS	Bikol, *Case (Grammar), Deep Structure, English, *Indonesian Languages, Language Universals, *Linguistic Theory, Maranao, *Nominals, Semantics, Sentence Structure, Surface Structure, Tagalog, Uncommonly Taught Languages, *Verbs
IDENTIFIERS	*Case Grammar, Focus, Waray

ABSTRACT

This paper presents evidence from Philippine languages which suggests a number of modifications in the theory of case grammar. Philippine languages and adjacent related languages mark the case relationship between the verb and one noun phrase in the sentence by a particle on the noun phrase and an affix on the verb, a phenomenon which in recent studies has been called "focus." In "The Case for Case" (ED 019 631) Fillmore, working with Maranao, a Philippine language, incorporates focusing into his general theory of case grammar. The purpose of the present paper is to examine the Philippine situation more closely, since the author considers that what has been written on it from the case grammar point of view usually considers only part of the evidence. Examples used here are drawn largely from Tagalog, Bikol and Waray. In the first sets of examples, Fillmore's underlying case preposition is intuitively clear with some modification, and it is easy to go from there to the correct surface focus. After examining these examples, the author considers a class which suggests that the grammar should account for another underlying case: the associative. (Author/FWB)

ED037711

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Case Grammar in Philippine Languages

Preliminary Draft

Alan M. Stevens
Dept. of Linguistics
Queens College
Flushing, N. Y. 11367

AL 002 336

Evidence from Philippine languages suggests a number of modifications in the theory of case grammar.

It is well known that these languages and adjacent related languages mark the case relationship between the verb and one noun phrase in the sentence by a particle on the NP and an affix on the verb. In recent studies this has been called focus.

In The Case for Case Fillmore incorporated focusing into his general theory of case grammar. In discussing Maranao (spoken in the southern Philippines) he states the following: "One NP is chosen as topic for every sentence, and this choice is recorded in the following way: its original case preposition (in Fillmore's sense) is replaced by (the focusing marker), and an affix is inserted into the verb which indicates the case category of the chosen NP."[1]

I would like to examine the Philippine situation more closely since what has been written on it from the case grammar point of view usually considers only part of the evidence. I will draw my examples largely from three languages I have worked on: Tagalog, Bikol and Waray. Other Philippine languages for which I have seen published material are quite similar.[2] In the 1st sets of examples Fillmore's underlying case preposition is intuitively clear with some modifications and we can easily go from there to the correct surface focus. After examining these, we will consider a class which suggests that the grammar should account for another underlying case: the associative.

The focused NP is definite. Pronouns have their own focused forms, and personal names have a special focusing particle. Some languages, such as Tagalog, have a single focusing particle for all other nouns. Other languages, such as Bikol, have two focusing particles for other nouns; one definite and the other anaphoric.

Let us start by looking at sentences in which the focused NP is the agent. Other case relations are typically handled by two other particles or markers, one for objects and adnominal functions, and the other for all other case relations; dative, instrumental, etc. though there are Philippine languages which split up the latter cases. Pronouns and personal names cannot be objects of agentive verbs; they are always in a dative relationship to these verbs.

In the examples to be given below, the verb will be perfective aspect unless otherwise noted. The focused NP will be underlined.

In Tagalog, the objects of agentive verbs are indefinite.

TAG
(1) b-um-ili sya nang damit. 'He bought some clothing.'
buy-A F,A O-clothing

The non-focus, non-objective cases are handled by sa or a phrase containing sa.

TAG
(2) sa ákin 'from me'
para sa ákin 'for me'

In some other languages, such as Waray, there are two non-focus object particles: indefinite and definite

WAR
(3) p-um-alit hiya hin bugas. 'He bought some rice.'
buy-A F,A O-rice
(4) p-um-alit hiya han bugas " " the "

Bikol appears to have three such objective particles: 'indefinite', 'definite' and 'anaphoric'.

Philippine languages have three other types of focus. The agents of all such sentences are identical in form to adnominal or genitive forms.

The first type largely focuses on Fillmore's objective and Factitive. I will call these all O below.

In the UCLA-Integration of Transformational Theories of English Syntax[3] this is called NEUTRAL: The case associated most closely with the verb itself, and least interpretable independently of the verb.

TAG
(5) b-in-ili nya ang damit. 'He bought the clothing.'
buy-O -F,A F-clothing

BIK
(6) pig-bakal nya an batag. 'He bought the banana.'
buy-O -F,A F-banana
(7) pig-bakal nya si batag. id (anaphoric)

In addition to such obvious objective cases, this focus also occurs for the end point of a motion.

BIK
(8) luwas-un mu sya. 'Go out to him.'
imp-go out-O -F,A F-he
you
(9) abut-un mu yan. 'Reach out for that.'
imp-reach-O -F,A F-that
you

The agent of the embedded verb in a causative sentence is also focused on with the objective focus since it is the object of the higher verb-- the causative.

BIK
(10) pig-pa-kakan ku sya kan batag. 'I had him eat the banana.'
cause-eat-O -F,A me F-he O-banana

This is not predictable from the agentive focus in which the agent is dative.

BIK
(11) nag-pa-kakan aku kan batag saíya. 'I had him eat the banana
caus-eat-A F me O-banana D-him

The second type of non-agentive focus covers both instrumental and benefactive as well as others to be discussed below.

TAG
(12) i-p-in-útul nya nang káhuy ang kampit. 'He cut wood with the axe.'
cut-I/B -F,A he O-wood F-axe

BIK
(13) i-pig-súrat nya an lápis na yan. 'He wrote with that pencil.'
Write-I/B F-pencil that

WAR
(14) i-p-in-alit ku hiya hin bugas. 'I bought some rice for him.
buy-I/B -F,A me F-he O-rice

TAG
(15) i-p-in-útul nya aku nang tubu. 'He cut some sugar-cane for me.'
cut-I/B -F,A he F-me O-s.c.

The third type of non-agentive focus covers a wide variety of locative and dative relations as well as other types to be discussed below.

BIK
(16) t-in-aqw-an nya aku ng libru. 'He gave me a book.'
give-D/L -F,A F-me O-book

TAG
(17) b-in-ilh-an nya aku nang damit. 'He bought clothing from me.'
buy-D/L -F,A F-me O-clothing

Similarly, he bought clothing at or from the store.

Included here are other examples of Fillmore's definition of DATIVE "an animate being is affected by the state or action".

BIK
(18) ná-alas-dusíh-an sinda. 'They kept on till 12 o'clock.'
invol.-12 o'clock-D/L F-they

(19) na-rayuq-an aku kan Ateneo 'I felt it was far to the Ateneo.'
invol.-far-D/L F-me O-

(20) na-dipisíl-an sya sa... 'He had a hard time in...'
invol.- -D/L F-he prep.

(21) na-agáh-an sya sa tinampu. 'He was overtaken by morning on the road.'
invol.-morning D/L F-he prep-road

Another type of D/L is where an animate being, the non-focus agent in the S, experiences an involuntary emotion or perception.

BIK
(22) na-arám-an ku na ... 'I found out that...'
invol-know-D/L -F,D

(23) ná-lingaw-an ku na... 'I forgot that...'
invol-forget-D/L

(24) ná-gustuh-an ku ... 'I got to like...'
invol-like-D/L

(25) ná-girumdum-an ku ... 'I remembered ...'
invol-remember-D/L

Many D/L are what we can call 'ablative' in meaning, where the object is being taken away or removed from the person or location which is in focus. "Buy from" has been exemplified in sentence 17 above. Other examples are:

TAG
(26) p-in-utúl-an nya ang káhuy. 'He cut (something) from the wood.'
cut-D/L -F,A F-wood

	WAR			
(27)	na-wadq-an	aku	hin kwarta.	'I lost some money.'
	invol-lose-D/L	F-me	O-money	

There are many verbs for which a D/L surface focus is unexpected, at least from a superficial examination of the corresponding English sentence. If, for example, we take "She washed the clothing." we would expect that focusing on "clothing" would yield an objective focus parallel to "She bought the clothing." What we find, instead, is a D/L focus.

	WAR			
(28)	l-in-abah-an	níya	an panaptun.	'She washed the clothing.'
	wash-D/L	-F,A	F-clothing	
(29)	h-in-ugás-an	níya	an manga plátu.	'She washed the dishes.'
	wash-D/L	-F,A	F-pl.-dish	

It is not possible to predict this from the corresponding agentive focus sentence. It is the verb itself which determines the correct object focus in each case.

	WAR			
(30)	p-um-alit	hiya	han plátu.	'She bought the dish.'
	buy-A	F-she	O-dish	
(31)	nag-húgas	hiya	han plátu.	'She washed the dish.'
	wash-A	F-she		
(32)	p-in-alit	níya	an plátu.	'She bought the dish.'
	buy-O	-F,A	F-	
(33)	h-in-ugás-an	níya	an plátu.	'She washed the dish.'
	wash-D/L	-F,A		

At this point we could consider the possibility of sub-categorization of verbs as has been suggested by Fillmore[4] and others. We can say that the verb meaning "buy" takes the arguments: agentive and objective, as well as some others.

On the other hand, the verb "wash clothing" has the arguments: agentive and D/L, as well as others, but not objective.

Such subcategorization has, in fact, been done in some recent studies of Philippine languages.[5] Verbs have been divided up into classes depending on whether they "take" objective focus or D/L focus for objects, etc. I would like to argue, however, that in many instances the case marking reflects a more general, perhaps a universal, characteristic of the verb in question. Other verbs in Philippine languages, which have D/L focus and not objective focus are peel, sweep, and clean. It is clear that semantically such verbs do not have the same kind of relationship between action and goal as do verbs like buy and hit. Rather they indicate a privative or ablative action on the surface of the goal. This is reflected in the following ways in English:

(34) He swept the floor.

He swept the dirt off the floor.

*He swept the dirt.

The last is unacceptable except in the meaning of sweeping the surface of the dirt or sweeping something off the top of the dirt.

(35) He washed the floor.

He washed the sand off the floor.

*He washed the sand.

Again, the last only in the reading is not intended here.

(36) He peeled the potatoes.

He peeled the skin off the potatoes.

*He peeled the skin.

The ablative or privative, i.e. D/L, nature of these sentences is clearly shown by the fact that the unacceptable sentences above can be made acceptable by adding a directional particle such as away, off, or up. He swept the dirt away, He swept up the dirt, He peeled away the skin, He peeled the skin off.

It is less clear why some other verbs are D/L focus. For example: open and close. But semantically it seems simple to reinterpret these as to open up or close up a space or pull a door away from or towards a position in space. The corresponding German verbs, clearly show such directionality.

What happens if we want to focus on the location of such an action in Philippine languages? We still get a D/L focus, but there is an additional prefix (underlined below), at least in the three languages under discussion here. Compare the following with 33.

WAR

(36a) ini an hugas-an nga p-in-ag-hugás-an ku han plátu.
this F wash place which wash-D/L -F,A 'I' O-plate

'This is the place in which I washed the plate.'

(36b) ini an lamísa nga p-in-ag-parút-an ku han mangga.
this F table which peel-D/L -F,A 'I' O-mango

'This is the table at which I peeled the mango.'

The extent to which this is obligatory is not clear to me.

The Philippine evidence seems to show no difference between Fillmore's dative and locative. It may be that the only difference between them is that the dative typically concerns animate NP's and the locative concerns inanimate

NP's. Apparent cases of locative plus animate NP are always interpretable as locative plus part or all of the body of the animate NP.

Many other verbs focus on what we would expect to be their direct objects by means of what I have been calling the I/B focus.

	BIK					
(37)	i-t-in-au	nya	sakuq	an libru.	'He gave me the book.'	
	give-I/B	-F,A	D-me	F-book		

This is again not predictable from the agentive focus. Compare 'buy' and 'give' in Bikol.

(38)	nag-bakal	sya	ng batag	sakuq.	'He bought a banana from me.	
	buy-A	F-he	O-banana	D-me		
(39)	nag-tau	sya	ng batag	sakuq.	'He gave me a banana.'	
	give-A	A	O	to me		
(40)	pig-bakal	nya	sakuq	an batag.	'He bought the banana from me	
	buy-O	-F,A	D-me	F-		
(41)	i-pig-tau	nya	sakuq	an batag.	'He gave the banana to me.'	
	give-B/I		D-me			

It would again be possible to put these verbs into a subcategory taking agentive, instrumental/benefactive (but not objective). Further examination, however, shows what I believe must be considered another underlying case.

The verbs which have this type of focus for objects are motion verbs in which the object is carried along with the motion but is not directly acted on by the verb. Included here are: give, put, throw, sell, say, bury, tie, take along, add, hand, over, and a large number of verbs indicating the transportation of something in a specific direction; it is probably no historical

accident that many Philippine languages have a nominal prefix of the same shape as the instrumental verbal prefix, meaning directionality.

John Wolff, writing on another Philippine language, Cebuano, has called this 'conveyance'.[6] Another possible term is portative. We find the same kind of meaning in Indonesian, a more distantly related language, where again benefactive, instrumental, and portative all have the same verbal affix.

IND
(42a) Dia menulis surat. He wrote a letter.
(42b) Dia menuliskan pikirannja. He wrote down his thoughts.
(42c) Dia mengirim surat. He sent a letter.
(42d) Dia mengirimkan surat. He sent off a letter.
(42e) Dia melarikan gadis itu. He ran off with that girl.

Comitative meanings are often also handled by these same affixes in Philippine languages.

BIK
(43) i-bayli mu si María. 'Dance with María.'
imp-dance-I/B -F,A F-
you

It is not unusual to find comitative and instrumental functions handled by the same surface case or preposition in a variety of languages. What about the portative function? There is evidence from English to show that many verbs imply a motion in which the object is simply carried along. This motion may be dative or ablative and is usually required in the surface structure.

(44a) He gave John the book.
b) He gave the book away.
c) *He gave {the book.
{a
Except in the special meaning of "donated".

d) He threw the book at me.
e) He threw John the book.
f) He threw the book away.
g) He threw the book down.
h) *He threw the book.
Except as an answer to What did he throw at you? with deletion of 'at me.

i) He wrote the letter.
j) He wrote his thoughts (down) on the paper.
k) *He wrote his thoughts.

For some motion verbs in English we must have a surface 'with'.

l) He swam away with the book.
m) *He swam the book.
n) *He ran the book.
o) He ran off with the book.

To return to Philippine languages, focusing on the object of the embedded verb in a causative also produces an I/B.

BIK
(45) i-p-in-a-bakal ku saíya an batag. 'I had him buy the banana.'
caus-buy-I/B -F,A D-he F-banana
me

TAG
(46) i-p-in-a-pútul nya an manga káhuy. 'He had the trees cut down.'
caus-cut-I/B -F,A F-pl-tree
he

If we look at all the semantic areas covered by what I have been calling I/B focus, namely: benefactive, instrumental, portative, comitative, and object of embedded verb in a causative, they can all be subsumed under a category of "associative"--that is, the goal is simply associated with the action. Such an addition to Fillmore's battery of cases has, in fact, already been suggested by Ilse Lehiste on the basis of Estonian evidence.[7] She also suggests that comitative and instrumental need not be differentiated. Perhaps benefactive instrumental and portative also do not have to be differentiated. Benefactive can only be animate while the other two cannot be, unless, we mean 'the body of the animate being.'

If instrumental and portative are the same case, and if Fillmore is correct,[8] then they should be mutually exclusive. In Philippine languages, however, we can easily have both in the same sentence.

WAR
(46a) ini an kwarta nga i-p-in-a-palit ku hin bugas han anak-ku
this F money which caus-buy-I/B -F,A O- rice O-child- my
'This is the money with which I had my child buy rice.'

This is less clear in English where we seem to have "manner" rather than "instrument." Even for those speakers who accept some of the following examples, there is disagreement over whether instrumental or comitative is involved.

47a. *He threw away the book with his hand.
b. ?He threw away the book with a shovel.
c. *He gave away the books with his hand.
d. ?He gave away the books with his left hand.
e. ?He wrote down his thoughts with a pen.
f. ?He wrote down his thoughts with a goose-quill pen.
g. ?He planted the seedlings with his hand.
h. He planted the seedlings by hand.
i. ?He planted the seedlings with a toothpick.
j. ?He buried the treasure with a shovel.
k. Tie him to the post with some rope.

These sentences are much more acceptable as He used a... to... or Using a... he... There are strong suggestions that the "with" clauses in sentences 47 are manner and not instrument, but it is unclear how "manner" fits into Fillmore's system. The UCLA report notes lack of TEMPORAL and MANNER cases in Fillmore's system.[9]

Once the correct focus is determined, a number of simple transformations are possible.

1) Topicalization, where the focused NP is made predicate of an equational sentence.

TAG
(48) b-in-ilh-an ku nang damit si Juan. 'I bought clothes from John.'
si Juan an b-in-ilh-an ku nang damit. 'John was the one I bought clothes from.'

2) In certain constructions there is no NP which is focused on. An example of this is the 'recentive'. The focused NP of the underlying sentence becomes an object in these sentences. A different set of endings is used on the verb.

WAR
(49) ka-í-inum ku laq. 'I just drank.'
rec-drink-A -F,A just
me

(50) ka-í-inum ku la han túbig. 'I just drank the water.'
rec-drink-A -F,A just O-water
me

BIK
(51) ka-í-inum-i pa sana nya kani-ng búti-ng ini.
rec-drink-D/L just -F,A O-this-bottle-this
him
'He just drank from this bottle.'

(52) ka-bá-bakal-a ku pa sana ka-ini sa-íya
rec-buy-O -F,A just O-this D-him
me

'I just bought this from him.'

(53) ka-pá-pa-bakal ku pa sana ning kakánun ki Jose.
rec-caus-buy-A -F,A just O-food D-
me

'I just had Jose buy some food.'

Conclusions

To some extent there are universal verb classes in terms of which cases they occur with. Another underlying case, associative, is suggested, but it may be entirely predictable from these verb classes and other grammatical categories such as causative.

Footnotes

1. Fillmore 1968a:55
2. There may be more serious differences in the Samal case marking system.
3. Stockwell et al 1968:9
4. Fillmore 1968b
5. Hall 1969; Kerr 1965; Reid 1966
6. Wolff 1966:385
7. Lehiste 1969:335
8. Fillmore 1968a:24
9. Stockwell et al 1968:10

Austin, Virginia M. Hartford Studies in Linguistics: "Attention, Emphasis and Focus in Ata Manobo", 1966.

Bloomfield, Leonard. Tagalog, 1964 (University Microfilms, Inc. reprint).

Fillmore, Charles. "The Case for Case", pp. 1-88 in Universals in Linguistic Theory ed. by Emmon Bach and Robert T. Harms, (1968a)

Fillmore, Charles. Foundations of Language 4 (1968b) "Lexical Entries for Verbs", pp. 373-393.

Hall, William C. Anthropological Linguistics Vol.II,7 (1969), "A Classification of Siocon Subanon Verbs", pp. 209-215.

Kerr, Harlan B. Oceanic Linguistics Vol. IV, 1,2 (1965), "The Case-Marking and Classifying Function of Cotabato Manobo Voice Affixes", pp. 15-47.

Lee, Ernest W. Oceanic Linguistics Vol. III, 1 (1964), "Non-Focus Verbs in Maguindanao", pp. 49-57.

Lehiste, Ilse. Foundations of Language 5 (1969), "'Being' and 'Having' in Estonian", pp. 324-341.

Reid, Lawrence Andrew. Oceanic Linguistics (special publication #2), An Ivatan Syntax, 1966.

Stockwell, R. P., P. Schachter, and B. Hall Partee, Integration of Transformational Theories on English Syntax, Vol.I UCLA (1968)

Wolff, John U. Beginning Cebuano, I,II, 1966, 1967.